<center>REMARKS</center>

Claims 1-43 are pending.  Claims 1, 5, 7, 18, 20-22, 26, 28, 39, 41-43 are amended, and claims 44-47 are new.


REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gross et al (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0143569).  Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are not anticipated by Gross.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method comprising:

identifying an entity name from an event associated with an article;
identifying contact information potentially about the entity name;
determining that the contact information is likely about the entity name; and
storing the entity name and at least some of the contact information determined to be likely about the entity name.


The claimed method identifies an entity name from an event associated with an article.  The method further identifies contact information potentially about the entity name.  It *determines* that the contact information is likely about the entity name, and stores the entity name and at least some of the contact information determined to be likely about the entity name.  Independent claims 22 and 43 recite similar features.

Gross discusses incremental searching of search targets, such as files, emails, email attachments, Web pages, and specific databases. The search results are narrowed after each character in a search string is entered by a user.   Gross, however, does not disclose *determining* that the contact information is likely about the entity name.

The Examiner asserts that Gross discloses this element in Figure 3A, reference nos. 324, 330A and 338A. Figure 3A merely depicts an interface for performing an email search, showing how a search may be incrementally performed using each entered character and displaying incrementally narrowed down search results. Neither the cited portions, nor the remainder of Gross, describe identifying contact information *potentially* about an entity name, *determining* that contact information is likely about the entity name, and then *storing* the entity name and at least some of the contact information determined to be likely about the entity name.

Claim 43 recites further limitations to those set forth in claims 1 and 22. As amended, it recites a method comprising:

> identifying an entity name from an event associated with an article, wherein the entity name is associated with an entity and the event is associated with a user;
> identifying contact information potentially about the entity name;
> determining that the contact information is likely about the entity name;
> *associating an entity ID with the entity name*;
> indexing the entity name and at least some of the contact information determined to be likely about the entity name based on the entity ID;
> storing the entity name and at least some of the contact information determined to be likely about the entity name;
> receiving a search query relating to the entity name;
> identifying at least some of the *contact information* determined to be likely about the entity name as relevant to the query; and
> outputting at least some of the contact information determined to be likely about the entity name.

In addition to the limitations described previously with regard to claims 1 and 22, claim 43 describes a method that *associates an entity ID with the entity name*, indexes the entity name and at least some of the contact information determined to be likely about the entity name based on the entity ID, stores the entity name and at least some of the contact information determined to be likely about the entity name, receives a search query relating to

the entity name, and identifies at least some of ***contact information*** determined to be likely

about the entity name as relevant to the query.

The Examiner asserts that Gross discloses "associating an entity ID with the entity

name" in Figure 3A and paragraph 117. As described above, Figure 3A merely depicts an

interface for performing an email search, showing how a search may be incrementally

performed using each entered character. Paragraph 117 describes how the incremental

searching is carried out:

> [0117] FIGS. 3G-H illustrate the email search interface during two
> different stages of an incremental search. The main search field 322A has
> the character string "2003-0" entered, the from field 330A has the
> character string "KU" entered, and folder field 334A has the character
> string "IN" entered, and the to field 338A has the character string "KM"
> entered with the NOT argument (-) preceding it. The search engine has
> narrowed the emails listed in list pane or area 324A to the twelve that have
> the character string "2003-0" in any of the emails' attributes or content,
> have "KU" in the from field, are located in a folder having the character
> string "IN" in the folder name, and that does not have the character string
> "KM" in the to field. The character strings are identically entered in FIG.
> 3H, except the character string ("2003-07") entered in the main search
> field 322A now has one additional search character (a "7"). Substantially
> immediately after the "7" was entered, the search application
> incrementally narrowed the number of emails listed in the list pane 324A
> from the twelve illustrated in FIG. 3G to the four emails listed in FIG. 3H.

Paragraph 117 simply does not describe "associating an entity ID with the entity

name." Rather, the various character strings described in this paragraph are examples of

incremental searching; no ***association of the entity ID with the entity name*** is described. For

example, the paragraph makes clear that "the character string 'KM' entered with the NOT

argument (-) preceding it" would locate emails that do "not have the character string 'KM' in

the to field." There is clearly no association of any entity name with the character string "-

KM." Moreover, <u>different</u> email messages (or entity names by the Examiner's interpretation)

are retrieved in response to the incremental searching; there is no association of an entity ID with the entity name. The character strings mentioned in paragraph 117 are not entity IDs associated with entity names; rather they are merely character strings that a user enters to perform incremental searching.

The Examiner further states that the element "identifying at least some of contact information determined to be likely about the entity name as relevant to the query" is shown in Figure 3C. Figure 3C shows a Web Search interface page that has the search terms "Knobbe" and "Intellectual Property" highlighted within the search results. (Paragraph 0121). However, neither the search results nor the highlighting of the search terms is an *identification of contact information* determined to be likely about the entity name. As such, this element is not shown in the reference.

Neither the cited portions, nor the remainder of Gross, describe "associating an entity ID with the entity name" and "identifying at least some of contact information determined to be likely about the entity name as relevant to the query." Indeed, Gross is focused on searching and also does not identify contact information *potentially* about an entity name and *determine* that the contact information is likely about the entity name, as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 22 and 43 are allowable over the cited reference for the reasons described above. The dependent claims not specifically mentioned above incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of this application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully Submitted,
DAVID BENJAMIN AUERBACH, ET AL.

Date: _February 5, 2007_         By:    /Brenda M. Simon/

Brenda M. Simon, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 48,449
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7198
Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: bsimon@fenwick.com